

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended. Claims 3, 10 and 18 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-17, 19 and 20 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTION – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 issued to Alexander, et al. (*Alexander*). Claims 3, 10 and 18 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3, 10 and 18 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-17, 19 and 20 are not anticipated by *Alexander*.

Claim 1 recites:

providing a graphical user interface indicating a season premiere episode corresponding to a plurality of upcoming season series of television programs; and
in response to the selection of one or more season premiere episodes through said interface, automatically recording the season series.

Thus, Applicants claim providing an indication of a plurality of season premiere episodes via a graphical user interface. Claims 8 and 15 recite similar limitations.

Alexander merely shows an advertisement for a season premiere episode. See Figs 10A and 10B. *Alexander* further discloses that a programming recorder may be set to record at a particular time. However, *Alexander* does not disclose automatically recording a season series in response to selection of one or more of a plurality of

displayed upcoming season premiere episodes. Therefore, *Alexander* cannot anticipate the invention of claims 1, 8 and 15.

Claims 2 and 4-6 depend from claim 1. Claims 9 and 11-13 depend from claim 8. Claims 16, 17, 19 and 20 depend from claim 15. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are not anticipated by *Alexander* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 14 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Alexander* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,020,880 issued to Naimpally (*Naimpally*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 14 are not rendered obvious by *Alexander* and *Naimpally*.

Naimpally is cited to teach acquiring program data over the Internet. See page 3 of the Office Action. As a preliminary matter, the Office Action does not provide motivation from the cited references to support the proposed combination. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination is improper. Further, assuming that the combination is proper, *Naimpally* does not cure the deficiencies of *Alexander* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Alexander* and *Naimpally* can teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 7 and 14.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-17, 19 and 20 are in condition for allowance

and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date:

MARCH 14, 2005

Paul A. Mendonsa

Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

14 MARCH 2005

Date of Deposit

DEBORAH L. HIGHAM

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

S. H. O. —

Signature

3-14-05

Date